

FF + C + Les Jrd

Patru vs Ee v Bd - super v ele elue

N tenured but terminated 7/24/99 after she had accepted Bd's offer + renewal

Suit in Ohio ct - K heard + K interference

Ohio ct ruled Bd wrongly terminated

tr dis'd tort cl vs indiv Bd members, at IT's request, sans prej
next da, 1983 suit in fed ct vs Bd + members - sefam, + suit v count v's
6th ct ruled

- 1) fed ds cd hv b liti as pt v + c/a in state ct. i: les jrd
- 2) st ds barred by 5/2 v 1 yr

cb + 'd

Sty constr

I wd +, but narrowly, in men v my dissent in Allen + Kramer

Ct wd + + do so broadly, so I shd sep concur

My dissent in Allen rested on propos 1983 + had no choice v forum

He was a D to a St^{com} chg v known person - 4 Am issue

Kramer rested on nature of state ct review v abstrc rule

In review on an abstr + cognicio basis only - i: no full judicial review

I recog in Allen the proper preclusion prms applied in 1983 actn

? here is where 1938 Xs are any fed pol in 1983

No - it cd hv best suit in fed ct, but chose n to do so

she was in an offensive posture

ac + n pari too extreme (th CE is t only applic preclusion doc in 1983)

i: cd give only a narrow t'g opin whn ct wd n produce

len de v c msgmt here ?

? v what St law
is on preclusion, +
to what extent a
fed ct applies it